

# Illinois U Library TOWN MEETING



★ ★

January 22, 1956  
Vol. 21, No. 39  
906th Broadcast

## "WOODROW WILSON: HIS AMBITIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS"

### *Speakers:*

SEN. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

DR. COLGATE W. DARDEN

AUGUST HECKSCHER

### *Moderator:*

DR. SHEPHERD L. WITMAN



From Staunton, Virginia, for  
The Woodrow Wilson Centennial  
Commission.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time

## "WOODROW WILSON: HIS AMBITIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS"

ANNOUNCER: In commemoration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, 28th President of the United States, Town Meeting tonight originates from his birthplace -- historic Staunton, Virginia. The program is under auspices of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia. We are broadcasting from the auditorium of Mary Baldwin College. The Mary Baldwin Chapel formerly was the Presbyterian church of which Woodrow Wilson's father was minister. The birthplace of President Wilson is now a public shrine and, in this centennial year, funds are being raised for its further restoration and preservation. The City of Staunton invites you to visit this historic home sometime -- to see the dignity and simplicity of family life in the 1850's and to be strengthened by renewed faith in the Wilson vision of world peace and brotherhood.

Now, to preside as moderator of our discussion, here is Shepherd L. Witman, Director of Residential Seminars on World Affairs. Dr. Witman!

DR. WITMAN: Good evening, everyone. Our country, as you know, has grown great and influential among mankind because we, its citizens, have been required from time to time to pass through periods of stress and strain. These are the times when it seemed necessary to change the course of the ship of state and try new waters. The result may be good or it may be bad, but it is always different.

The period from 1912 to 1918 was one of those times when the United States was readjusting its economic and political pattern, and when men and women -- maybe even you and I -- had to make changes in our lives. It was a time when the United States emerged from its post Civil War period of national introspection and domestic self concern to become a great nation in world affairs as well as in its own internal institution. What happened then has stamped us forever and today our way of life shows the results of that period.

For that space of time, the name of one man comes at once to the mind of each of us -- Woodrow Wilson. Born here in Staunton, Virginia 100 years ago, he lived to lead his countrymen into the 20th Century. This evening's TOWN MEETING, coming to you from his birthplace will discuss the man -- his hopes and his accomplishments.

What more appropriate way could there be to introduce this evening's discussion than to hear the voice of Mr. Wilson himself. Through Heritage Productions, we secured a recorded statement which appears on the album entitled "If I'm Elected." This is the voice of Mr. Wilson as recorded 44 years ago, in 1912. It was in this year that Mr. Wilson, then Governor of New Jersey, was selected by the Democratic party as its Presidential candidate. Woodrow Wilson, speaking in 1912:

MR. WILSON: We stand in the presence of an awakened nation, impatient of progress and make-believe. The nation has awakened to a sense of neglected ideals and neglected duties -- to a consciousness that the rank and file of her people find life very hard to sustain. Her young men find opportunity barren and her older men find business difficult to endure and maintain, because of circumstances of privilege and private advantage which have interlaced their subtle threads throughout almost every part of the framework of our present laws.

She has awakened to the knowledge that she has lost certain cherished liberties and wasted priceless resources which she has solemnly undertaken to hold in trust for posterity and for all mankind, and to the conviction that she stands confronted with an occasion for constructive statesmanship, such as has not arisen since the great days in which her government was set up.

There never was a time when impatience and suspicion were more keenly aroused by private powers selfishly employed -- when jealousy of everything concealed or touched in any purpose not linked with the general good or inconsistent with it more sharply or immediately displayed itself. Nor is the country ever more susceptible to unselfish appeals or to the high arguments of sincere judgment. These are the unmistakable symptoms of an awakening.

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

DR. WITMAN: That was the voice of Woodrow Wilson. And now to discuss our subject of this evening, "Woodrow Wilson: His Ambitions and Achievements," we have three gentlemen with us, the first of whom will speak in just a minute.

He is August Heckscher, who is President of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and author of the forthcoming book, "The Politics of Woodrow Wilson." He has just left his position as chief editorial writer of the "New York Herald Tribune" to become head of the 20th Century Fund. A member of the Tribune's staff for the past eight years, Mr. Heckscher retains his place on the newspaper's board of directors. Mr. Heckscher!

MR. HECKSCHER: We are going to hear something about Wilson, the national leader and Wilson, the international statesman from two men who are well-qualified to speak. I thought I would just say a few words here at the beginning about Woodrow Wilson as a man of the 20th Century -- a great prophet and philosopher -- a man confronted, like all of us, by immense changes and challenges and finding his way through the confusion of these modern times.

To a unique degree, Wilson had brooded upon the problems of democracy. Long before he was called to take the center of the stage, he had asked himself some of the great questions which still trouble us now when the century is more than half through. How can the individual keep his independence, Wilson asked, in a society dominated by groups and organizations? How can the conscience of a free man retain its ascendancy when the standards of the mass seem to prevail more and more? How can humanism survive amid the novel emphasis on science and belief in God survive amid the growing tendency to think of man as the omnipotent master of nature?

I have read Wilson's writings of those early years. I have followed his thoughts during that long period when he waited in the wings for the call which he knew would finally come to him. He was a philosopher through all that period, an aspiring mind facing all the hard facts of the new age which he saw about him, and yet not losing his hold upon the old values. When Wilson finally did emerge to play his part -- the part that it had been his destiny to play from the beginning -- he showed himself superbly practical as a leader of men. You will undoubtedly hear more about that. He knew how to arouse their loyalties and to evoke their interests and to bring them together in combinations pursuing a common aim. But he kept as well -- and this is what I wanted to stress -- the spirit of the philosopher. He could see the abiding cause in the midst of the passing causes of the day. He could see the truth that endures amid all the compromises and the expediency that are necessary in our politics. Above all, Wilson saw this age as one that called out for the best that is in men, that asked for them great efforts -- intellectual, spiritual and moral. He knew that if men are to be master of their faiths, they must somehow manage to be better and to rise higher than they have often shown themselves capable of in other periods of our history, for he knew that we lived in a great age -- an age, he said in one of his early writings, like Shakespeare's, when an old world is passing away, a new world coming in, an age of new speculations and every new adventure of the mind a full stage, an intricate plot, a universal play of passion, an outcome no man can foresee. It is to this world, Wilson continued, this sweep of action that our understanding must be stressed and pitted -- it is in this age that we must show the human qualities.

Wilson saw the challenge of those times and of these. He rose to that challenge so far as he was given strength and vision to do so, and he was given great strength and great vision and today, 100 years after his birth, his example and his philosophy still remain vital to us.

DR. WITMAN: Our second speaker and distinguished guest is Colgate W. Darden, President of the University of Virginia and former Governor of his state. He has been a member of the Virginia Assembly and of the United States House of Representatives. During the first World War he served with the Marine Corps and with the French Army. He was United States Representative to the Tenth Assembly of the United Nations which has just adjourned. We are delighted to have you hear, Dr. Darden!

DR. DARREN: Dr. Witman, it is as a great international figure that Mr. Wilson appeals most to me. It is in that role that his name became a household word. He saw long before the close of the war in Europe that it would end in utter desolation and in utter exhaustion. He saw that it might be possible to forge out of the ashes some form of international cooperation, or some scheme of the concerted action on the part of the powers in the keeping of the peace of the world. And it was to this end that he directed his activities.

He saw more clearly than did any man of his time that it would not be possible to reconcile quickly the bitter and deep quarrels of Europe. He did not understand nor did he know -- nor is their reason to believe that he should have understood -- the effect of the agreements that had been made between the allies in their last desperate effort to win, and it was these agreements, these secret negotiations, that caused him so much trouble in power. Immediately upon the close of the war he addressed himself to the organization, some organization in the cause of World Peace, and set off to play an important, a vital, although an unsuccessful part in the peace negotiations at Paris. I say "unsuccessful" because they were unsuccessful in that the United States, to its great shame, I think, failed to ratify the treaty that had been achieved at such effort and such labor on his part. He secured, over the objection of many of the powers with whom the United States had been an ally, a commitment to an organization known as the League of Nations for the keeping of the peace -- the joining together of those powers that had won the war, in an effort to maintain the peace of the world.

He organized it on the basis that there were no real victors in war, as we well know now some years after the venture failed and some years after his death. He saw that the war would draw to an end with no man or no nation or no group actually having won as the result of it, and the basis of the League of Nations was that. The United States, as we all know now, failed to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and with it the League of Nations was repudiated. There are many amongst us who believe that had the League of Nations received the sanction which it deserved, and for which he labored so hard, that we might have avoided the second cataclysm that brought the world to the very brink of disaster because, certainly, only a few years after the death of Mr. Wilson we find the outbreak of the second World War with the movements of Japan in Asia, which were followed by Mussolini in North Africa, and then by Hitler in the deadly assault on the whole Western structure. The United States at no time, during that, was a part and part of the council of those seeking to keep the peace. That the United Nations has succeeded to the office and dignity of the League of Nations is in no way, in my opinion, a reflection upon Mr. Wilson's capacity and his contributions to his age and time. The truth is, had it not been for pettishness amongst the nations forming the United Nations, the League of Nations by reasonable amendment to its charter could have been made to serve admirably the purpose now being served by the United Nations -- so that Mr. Wilson's dream lives on and though the road is hard and though it is difficult and there will be troubles and difficulties in many parts of the world, and though we seem at times a long ways away from our capacity to maintain the peace of the world by concerted action, I am just as sure that in the long sweep of time that his dream will come to fruition, and it is his dream; as that now we live under the shadow next to unbelievable oppression and under the shadow of unspeakable danger.

DR. WITMAN: Our third distinguished guest is Senator Alben W. Barkley, who was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1912, the year Woodrow Wilson was elected president. He remained in the House for the next 14 years and then went on to the Senate and in 1948 to the vice-presidency of his country. Just elected to the Senate for the fifth time, in 1954, Mr. Barkley has received many citations for his outstanding citizenship, too numerous for us to mention but among them is the 1949 Franklin D. Roosevelt Four-Freedoms Award. It is a great pleasure to have you here and may we hear from you now, Senator Barkley!

SEN. BARKLEY: Thank you, Mr. Witman. I am very happy to be on this panel and I'm very happy also to have the pleasure of seeing Mrs. Woodrow Wilson in our audience.

I went to the House of Representatives on the 4th of March, 1913 -- the day on which Woodrow Wilson was first inaugurated President of the United States. I served all through his two terms of eight years and with the exception of two years, during which I was out of political circulation, I have been there ever since and am there now. I feel now, as I felt then, that the advent of Woodrow Wilson into our national life brought to our politics and to Washington a fresh breath of air that in some respects clarified the miasma and the staleness of politics as we knew it at that time and had known it for many years.

We have always believed, in this country, in the two-party system and we feel that under it we have made great political progress and the time will be very disastrous indeed if we should ever arrive at a juncture in our national affairs when there is such a multiplicity of political parties that no one of them can accept or be charged with responsibility. Prior to Mr. Wilson's election, the two political parties in this country had been accustomed to fight all the issues out on the question of a tariff. It made little difference what ailed the country, it was the tariff that was always brought out as the remedy for all human evils, so that in 1912 Mr. Wilson, while of course recognizing the importance of a tariff as a part of our domestic and international policy, brought into existence a new conception of the relationships between government and the people. He realized, as he had said in his campaign in 1912, that our economic system was out of joint -- that our banking laws were antiquated -- that our currency, the money with which we purchased and carried on our business, was inadequate to the needs of the country -- that agriculture needed stimulation -- that labor needed the justice of laws giving them their rights -- that the anti-trust laws which had been enacted back in the '90's were likewise antiquated and needed reformation and rejuvenation. And so it was in that atmosphere that Woodrow Wilson came to the White House as the President of the United States, realizing as he did, that there is a profound connection between government and the people -- realizing as he did that it is not merely the function of government to sit around idly, draw a salary and look complacently at the problems of the people and do nothing about it.

He had felt the same urge in New Jersey during his two years as Governor of that state, dealing with the intimate problems of New Jersey, corporations, labor, agriculture, wages, and all those things that affect the daily lives of the people. And he made such a profound impression on the country as the Governor of New Jersey that he was the logical candidate for the Democratic nomination for President in 1912. And, as a matter of fact, his whole scholastic career had laid the foundation for this outstanding service to the American people and his profound knowledge of the problems of politics, of society and of government. He had written a number of books on the subject, including "The State," "Cabinet Government," "Congressional Government" and "A History of the United States," so, when he became President of the United States, I would dare say that from a standpoint of scholarship and knowledge of government and its principles, he was the best equipped man who had ever been President of the United States, with the possible exception of Jefferson and I think, myself, he was more profoundly equipped than Jefferson when he entered the White House.

His first attention was drawn to the tariff and during his first few months the Underwood Tariff Law was enacted which was described at the time as the fairest tariff law that had ever been enacted in the history of the United States. Ever since the Civil War our currency system had been based upon our public debt, the debt that was a hangover from the War between the States. He realized that our commercial economy and our commercial community was cramped by a lack of adequate currency. It was due to his driving leadership that the Federal Reserve System was enacted which, at the time, was denounced by the great bankers of the country as socialistic but which no one of them now would dare propose to be repealed.

Legislation bringing up to date the anti-trust laws, creation of the federal trade commission, highway legislation, rural credit legislation and all forms of legis-

lation for our people were enacted under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson and I am proud to say that it was a part of my pleasure and duty to help enact those laws and not one of them has been repealed except the tariff law which was repealed when the Republicans came into power in 1920.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you very much Senator Barkley. Now we have some problems here which we have to analyze and talk out, Gentlemen. You have all presented very brilliant analyses of certain phases of Woodrow Wilson's political life and his contributions to this country, but there are other things which certainly need to be explored. For instance, as you were talking it occurred to me that I would like to raise the question to each of you; was Woodrow Wilson a true Progressive? I recall that there had been some questions raised, when I read history books, on this point. Was he really a Progressive, yet, he was identified with a Progressive Movement, I felt, by some of the things you've said, certainly what Senator Barkley said.

MR. HECKSCHER: I'd be glad to say that I think Wilson was in the line of great Progressives, of great Liberals in this country. He did believe when he came to power, as Senator Barkley has already indicated, that the American people were suffering under the burden of political bosses, of economic monopolies and of spiritual orthodoxies and his idea was to free men, to emancipate, as he said, the generous energies of the people. And he set about doing that piece by piece through the legislation to which we already have had reference here. That, to me, is the great liberal tradition and I think it is a question as to whether the New Deal was really in the line of development of the New Freedom, or whether it was something else and something different.

DR. WITMAN: Recently I have been reading a book in which I ran across this statement. The author said Mr. Wilson believed his party's most important task was to stay in power. This would hardly argue that he was truly a Progressive. What do you think, Senator?

SEN. BARKLEY: He felt that his party ought to remain in power as the agent and instrumentality through which his liberalism could be carried into law. He did not just want to hold office for the sake of it, he wanted the Democratic party, which was his party, to remain in power in order that he might, during his term, carry out his ideals of liberalism and progressivism. He could not have fostered and driven for the enactment of all these laws, that in a sense revolutionized our economy and our political thinking, without being a profound liberal. If I may use an illustration of that, on one occasion the entire Kentucky delegation went out to the White House to recommend an outstanding Kentucky judge for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States and when we had all made our little speeches, Mr. Wilson said, "Gentlemen, does your candidate believe that the law grows, or does he take the legalistic view that it is finished?" In that question he drew a description of the man he wanted to put on the Supreme Court because he believed that the law grows. He believed that society would become stagnant and stale unless the law grows just like society grows and economic requirements grow.

DR. DARREN: There is not the slightest doubt in the world in my mind that he was one of the great Progressives of all time in the United States. Had he believed that the party should stay in power, that that was its essential purpose. Mr. Wilson would not have stood out as firmly as he did against the rise in passion for war in the early part of the first World War. Moreover, he would not have safeguarded as he did the rights of the individual in all of his legislation and guard it as he did against an omnipotent state. That's the acid test, it seems to me, of liberalism and progressivism, as to whether or not an individual is willing to safeguard at any cost, a political leader or political party is willing to safeguard the right of the individual and limit the power of the state and certainly Mr. Wilson believed in both of those things.

MR. HECKSCHER: I think there is one other comment that we should make on that and that is that from his earliest writings and his earliest time as a teacher of government and politics, Wilson believed that the president of the United States must be the leader of his party as well as the leader of the nation and he believed unless there was responsible government, unless there were two parties that stood for principles

that our politics did descend into a kind of what Senator Barkley has referred to as a miasma.

DR. WITMAN: As a matter of fact, President Wilson strongly urged and practiced, did he not, vigorous executive leadership in the party and in the government?

SEN. BARKLEY: If I may interpose there, he restored the dignity of the president of the United States from a sort of lackadaisical attitude toward it. He did not abuse the powers of the president, but he insisted that they existed and that they should be honored and respected and exercised.

DR. WITMAN: There has been some question raised as to whether this is compatible with the truly liberal and progressive point of view which would stress the role of the legislature, would it not?

SEN. BARKLEY: The American people have never had much regard for a weak president. They have always wanted a strong one and they had one in Woodrow Wilson.

DR. DARDEN: Not only that -- legislatures can be oppressive beyond belief. The majority can be as oppressive as a monarch or tyrant. A strong executive is a counterbalance to that in the American system. Our system of government isn't predicated upon the Congress being supreme and the executive simply being a minion of it.

MR. HECKSCHER: I think it is well to point out too, showing the other side of the coin, that what was perhaps Woodrow Wilson's worst mistake in terms of the results it led to, was the way he did make his appeal in 1918 for the election of a Democratic Congress. He was acting there along the lines which we have outlined, thinking in terms of responsible government, but the Republicans took that as in some way being an assault on their support of the war and on their patriotism and the Congress that was returned in 1918, just when Wilson most needed the support of a united country, was hostile to him.

SEN. BARKLEY: If I may comment there, I think that is the one political mistake that Mr. Wilson made while he was President. I've often spoken on the subject of what might have happened in the world if something else that happened that didn't. If the armistice had been signed a week sooner, he would have gotten a Democratic Congress without asking for it, but he made that appeal on the advice of somebody, whose identity I have never been able to establish, asking the country to give him a Democratic Congress and the Republicans made political capital of it and said that the President had insulted them and, therefore, he did not get a Democratic Congress, but if the armistice had been signed a week sooner he would have had one.

DR. DARDEN: There was one other point in that connection that is worth remembering and that is that Mr. Wilson was a great student and a profound admirer of Edmund Burke and that should stand as a guarantee of his political thinking. It was against that background and for that reason that I think, as a much younger man, he was so critical of Mr. Jefferson and his political thinking in the articles that appeared at the close of the last century.

DR. WITMAN: One of his great contributions was the fact that as a scholar he made such an important contribution to our political institution, particularly through his early publications, his writings and studies, in which he again stressed the executive leadership. I don't want to take too long on that one phase but it is one which has been considered pretty widely by scholars and students of Mr. Wilson and I thought we ought to explore it. What about the campaign of 1916? There has been a good deal of writing about Mr. Wilson's campaign of that year -- the measure of the sincerity of his approach to keeping us out of war when a few months later we went into war, in April of the following year, as a matter of fact. I think there is a good deal to be said about this and I would like to hear what you have to say.

SEN. BARKLEY: I would like to say this. During the campaign of 1916 Woodrow Wilson never appealed to the voters of this country to elect him because he had kept them out of war. He never used that expression. He made no such claim. As a matter of history, he had done so and many of his supporters used the argument that he had kept us out of war, but Wilson did not himself do so and he never promised that he could keep us out of war. Events controlled that and although he was elected, I should say in part at least because he had been able to steer us out of that European conflict,

events so unfolded themselves within four months that it was inevitable that we should join the war and impossible for us to remain out. But it has been a great injustice to Woodrow Wilson himself that his enemies have taunted him and his friends and his party with the assertion that he was elected on a false premise, on a false issue that he kept us out of war.

MR. HECKSCHER: I would just like to add to that which, of course, I subscribe to -- Wilson never used the phrase he kept us out of war -- I would just like to add why Wilson felt so strongly through that period that if America is compatible with its dignity and its rights, it should keep out of the war. He tried up to the very last to save the United States from going in. Why? He did it because, as he said in private just on the eve of our entrance into the war, that if we should go in that the last great mediating nation would be drawn into the foil and this country would forget tolerance and the standards of justice which had to prevail in the peace, would find that there was no single nation which could speak authoritatively for those standards. So all through the campaign of 1916, although he was not boasting that he kept us out, he was certainly hoping very earnestly that we might keep out.

SEN. BARKLEY: I shall never forget his address to the joint session of the two Houses on the 2nd day of April, 1917, when he asked for a declaration of war, because it tortured his very soul to have to ask Congress to do that and in the opening sentences of his message he said, "It is a terrible thing to lead a nation into war." And yet, it was necessary.

MR. HECKSCHER: There's a story too, in the memoirs of his secretary, Mr. Tumulty, which described how, when Woodrow Wilson went back to the White House after delivering that speech, to which the Senator has just referred, he sat there with the echoes of the great cheering still in his ears and he said, "Why are they cheering me? Don't they realize that I am sending their boys into war?"

DR. WITMAN: We are moving pretty much into the period of Mr. Wilson's career with which I think all of us have perhaps our deepest interest, and that is the period when he was so vigorously engaged in leading the world into a new concept of democracy and leading the world into a new concept of international security and trying to develop the League of Nations which had such an unfortunate conclusion. Let's consider that question -- the role of Mr. Wilson in the creation of the League of Nations, the ultimate defeat of that organization, at least the defeat of the United States' participation of that organization, and examine that from several facets. What happened here? Let's first look at it from a standpoint of what Mr. Wilson did. How much was he a part of the creation of this great new concept which was a new vision for mankind and which so gripped the imaginations of peoples all over the world?

DR. DARDEN: Mr. Wilson was the League of Nations. He was the man who thought the concept through. He was the individual that prepared the way for it before the end of hostilities and he was the individual that almost single-handed, time after time in Paris, defended it. It was his idea, his dream, and only his tenacity and enormous power of the United States that got it accepted at Paris. And it is, in my opinion, to our eternal shame that we rejected it here when it was put up in the Congress of the United States after the close of the first World War -- and to our great loss and great cost that we rejected it.

DR. WITMAN: Why did we reject it if Mr. Wilson was so successful in having it accepted by other peoples throughout the world?

DR. DARDEN: We rejected it because a curious wave of isolationism swept over us, even as our armies were being demobilized. We were sick and tired of war. We were troubled about the cost of it -- both in men and money, and we had the notion that we could draw back behind these two great oceans and rest in peace and security and that thinking dominated us until we reached the very threshold of the second World War.

MR. HECKSCHER: People often ask, "Couldn't we have gotten a favorable vote in the Senate if Wilson had been able to compromise, had been able to give Senator Lodge the reservations for which he was asking?" I know there are two points of view on that, it's certainly arguable, but I do feel, as you suggest, President Darden, that by that time the passions had grown so high that if Wilson had yielded an inch, he would

have found himself overrun by the opposition -- that Lodge and those with him would have used those concessions to wreck the League altogether.

DR. WITMAN: Senator Barkley, is it your point of view that Mr. Wilson's personality itself played a part in destroying the very dream which he had created?

SEN. BARKLEY: The answer to that is speculative. Nobody can know certainly whether it was his personality, or whether politics -- petty politics -- got into the thing and it made it an issue between the two political parties. Both political parties for years had been in favor of a league to enforce peace. They had established a Hague Court long before World War I and Mr. Wilson's driving power in behalf of a world organized for peace, instead of organized for war, is what made it possible for the Treaty of Versailles to contain the covenant of the League of Nations. Undoubtedly, at the time Mr. Wilson began his fight for it, the American people were overwhelmingly in favor of it. By the time the treaty was submitted to the Senate politics, petty politics, partisan politics, had gotten into it to such an extent that our people were divided and while the treaty got a majority of the Senate, it did not get the two-thirds required. Now whether, if Mr. Wilson had yielded a little, whether he had been a little more flexible and had agreed to some of these reservations that members of the Senate wanted the Senate would have adopted it or ratified it, I do not know and whether if we had ratified it our nation would have controlled it and dominated it and guided it to such an extent as to have made it more successful than it was, there are many people who believe that if the League of Nations could have stopped the Japanese when they went into China in 1931 or have stopped Mussolini when he went into Ethiopia in 1935 or could have stopped Hitler when he went into the Ruhr and the Rhine and all the rest, that World War II might never have happened. I do not know whether that is true or not, but certainly the League of Nations was not a complete failure. It did a lot of good things and upon its failure and upon its ruins was erected the United Nations which is a stronger organization than the League of Nations was because it has greater means for enforcing peace.

DR. WITMAN: We have been discussing President Wilson in terms of some of the things which he achieved, some of the characteristics of his great contribution to American statesmanship. We have said that Mr. Wilson was, in the final analysis, a true Progressive by virtue of the things which he accomplished, things which he made possible in his government. We have said that his strong executive leadership was an important and valuable contribution, in fact, perhaps his greatest contribution to American political practice that has ever been made. We said that his bipartisanship left something wanting in the development of his relationships abroad. We said that his campaign of 1916 was eminently honest, that it was not a dishonest campaign as some people have from time to time indicated, that Mr. Wilson was sincere in all of the things which he propounded in the 1916 days. We have said that it was a great tragedy that the great dream of Woodrow Wilson, the League of Nations which he himself, by the force of his own intellect and his own personality, was able to develop, was able to get accepted throughout the world, could not have been accepted by his own countrymen but that, as a matter of fact, it was this great accomplishment at that time which made possible the status of the United States today in its world relations.

I want to say one or two things now to the listening audience. We have with us tonight, Ladies and Gentlemen, a most distinguished and gracious lady. Although she is too modest to have accepted our invitation to say a word to you, I want to acknowledge here the honor we share in having the presence of Mrs. Woodrow Wilson. (Applause)

Thank you, Mrs. Wilson. Now we are going to continue with some questions from our audience.

QUESTIONER: Senator Barkley, do you think that the United States will be strong enough to support the ideas of Woodrow Wilson so that nations which now live under communism, such as my country, Slovakia, will be free?

SEN. BARKLEY: I would be an incorrigible pessimist if I did not think so. I do believe that under the ideals of Woodrow Wilson, as they have now been accepted by the free world and a part of the slave world, that the time will come when all nations will be free and all people will enjoy self government.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Heckscher, would you say that history has failed to justify Wilson's opposition to the Lodge reservations to the Treaty of Versailles?

MR. HECKSCHER: I am very glad to have just a word more to say on that. I have already indicated, I think, that in general I believe that by the time the fight settled down to those reservations, it was already lost. I think, in other words, that if Wilson had given in to Lodge he would have been beaten and, as history knows, he was beaten when he held out against Lodge. It's well to remember, I think, that when Woodrow Wilson came back from Paris after his first period there of negotiations with the draft of the Covenant in his hand, he did see the Senate and they did at that time undertake to put into it the reservations which the Senate was requesting. He went back to Paris with those reservations and that immediately did set up a number of difficulties with the European countries. They all said, well, if America can get changes in the Covenant, so can we. Or, we can get certain boundary adjustments which otherwise we couldn't have gotten by trading, by allowing Mr. Wilson for the sake of his public in America to accept these changes. That was a compromise and I think the verdict of the historians who have followed it most closely is that that compromise didn't lead to altogether good results.

QUESTIONER: Dr. Darden, do you think the League of Nations would have lived if the United States had entered it?

DR. DARREN: Yes, I do. I think it would have been an incalculable force for peace in the world and I think there is a reasonable chance that we might have avoided the second World War.

QUESTIONER: Senator Barkley, do you think that Mr. Wilson was favorably inclined to the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles?

SEN. BARKLEY: I think he had reservations with respect to some of those terms, but in a great enterprise like that no one negotiator or head of a nation can get all he wants or deserves in a treaty.

MR. HECKSCHER: Don't you think we could add, too, that Wilson believed so strongly that the League, if it were adopted, would be able to rectify any injustices which were in the peace treaty, that he was willing to accept some thing which, as you say,.....

SEN. BARKLEY: Unquestionably. He felt that if the League were established on a basis of world peace and world cooperation, that any harsh terms or injustices of it then could be ironed out and settled and adjusted.

DR. WITMAN: I'd like to ask Mr. Heckscher, who studied this question intimately recently, if it isn't true that Mr. Wilson was almost primarily concerned, insofar as the Treaty of Versailles was concerned, with that portion of it that provided for the League?

MR. HECKSCHER: I think that would not be quite justified to say. It is true that Mr. Wilson achieved a very great achievement -- the settlement of the League question first in the peace treaty -- but he went on from there and dealt with great detail and with a very skilled staff in Paris in all these other issues. It is sometimes said that Mr. Wilson wasn't as well informed on European problems as he should be, but there again the evidence of those who attended the sessions and have left their memoirs shows with what detail and with what earnestness he went into all the secondary matters. But, certainly, he did feel that having got the League, he had the means by which everything else could in time be fixed and made straight.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Heckscher, is there any provision which you think that President Wilson would have added to the United Nations Charter, had it been in his power?

MR. HECKSCHER: That's a very difficult question. I would rather stress just in one word the things that are in the United Nations Charter which Wilson would have so greatly supported. He would have supported the fact that the United Nations is based upon the will of the people, upon the universal opinion of mankind, that it isn't simply a league of sovereign nations, that it does express a moral opinion of the world and as the United Nations has unfolded in this decade, we have seen again and again how that moral force has been able to achieve results even where military weapons didn't play any part, or even where legalistic solutions weren't in order. I think the spirit of the United Nations is very close to the League of Nations.

QUESTIONER: Dr. Darden, do you think the Congressional mention of 1918 would have had a different outcome if it had come after, instead of before, the armistice?

DR. DARDEN: Yes, I do, but the real authority on that is Senator Barkley, sitting right here at my left, and he said that in his statement a few minutes ago. I think if the armistice had come just a little earlier, there wouldn't have been any question of the result.

QUESTIONER: Senator Barkley, since Wilson is generally considered a president with liberal views, what do you think would have been his reaction to such very liberal philosophies of the New Deal?

SEN. BARKLEY: The New Deal was broader in its concepts and based probably upon a more acute situation than the New Freedom. The New Freedom was -- Mr. Wilson himself didn't call that the New Freedom -- it became known as the New Freedom after he had published his book, after he became President, in which he embodied many of the ideas he had advanced as a candidate for President. But I think that the New Freedom, the readjustment of the relationship between our government and our people under Woodrow Wilson, was the very great contributing factor in the enactment of the New Deal program which required a broader base than that which was required in the days of Woodrow Wilson. There is nothing inconsistent between them.

MR. HECKSCHER: I would like to ask Senator Barkley a question on that since this interests me a great deal. Certainly, in Wilson's thinking there was a degree of individualism which wasn't present in the New Deal legislation or in the New Deal period. Wouldn't you agree with that?

SEN. BARKLEY: Wilson was an individualist in a sense, modified by his belief that, as I indicated in the question he asked us from Kentucky, whether a law which in government grows, whether it is progressive, whether it is expansive. I think Wilson probably was more of an individualist than Franklin D. Roosevelt but when it came to his concept of the duty of our government toward the people. I think he was a great mass thinker and planner for the American economy, and that's what the New Deal was, in my judgment.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Heckscher, Wilson had seen two of his child labor laws declared unconstitutional. He then appointed Brandeis to the Supreme Court. This ambition in relation to child labor laws was fulfilled immediately after his death. What are the implications of this determination.

MR. HECKSCHER: I think the question is interesting in connection, first of all, with the matter we have just been discussing. I was going to suggest to Senator Barkley that perhaps Wilson had not been as interested in social legislation as he was in reaffirming the rights of individuals, but here is a case which you do well to remind us of, where basic welfare legislation was very much in his interest. I don't think, if you meant to make any implication to suggest that Wilson packed the court, that he appointed a man who would favor his views in any narrow sense, that that's justified. One of the most eloquent of the letters of Woodrow Wilson is a great letter to the Senate asking that they confirm Brandeis and setting forth his qualities and his experience, but it was as a judge and as an interpreter of the law and not as a person who would follow his own politics.

SEN. BARKLEY: I might add there that when Mr. Wilson insisted that the farmers of this country should have means of credit, while that was a financial measure, it also had its social connotation and when he insisted in the anti-trust law that there should be written a sentence declaring that labor is not a commodity to be bartered at the marketplace, he was also thinking socially about the welfare of our people, so that you cannot draw a straight line and say all on the left is economic or legal, and all on the right is social, because they mixed all along the line, they intertwined with one another.

QUESTIONER: That is the implication which I meant to bring out -- his interest in social legislation.

QUESTIONER: Senator Barkley, is Henry Cabot Lodge's attitude toward the United Nations a repudiation of his grandfather's antagonism toward the League of Nations? Is he trying to compensate for his grandfather's error?

SEN. BARKLEY: That question raises a question of inheritance intellectually that I am not altogether able to answer but it is a strange anomaly that the grandson of the Henry Cabot Lodge who was instrumental, more than any other man, in defeating the League of Nations, has been very active not only in the writing of the United Nations and of its charter, but in his membership. It's a very refreshing experience to see the grandson of an incorrigible opponent of the League of Nations, one of the most enthusiastic advocates of the United Nations.

DR. WITMAN: President Darden has just returned from serving in the United Nations and I wonder if he wants to comment to that?

DR. DARDEN: I don't think it's any compensation for the view of his grandfather. Cabot Lodge is an enormously effective, in my opinion, representative of the United States in the United Nations. I believe he believes in it very genuinely and very deeply and I have never heard him discuss the role of his grandfather and I think that he feels that there's a change of circumstance. At any rate, his dedication of it, in my opinion, is without question.

QUESTIONER: Dr. Darden, what do you think Woodrow Wilson's greatest accomplishment was while in office?

DR. DARDEN: I think his work for the League of Nations was his greatest accomplishment by all odds.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Heckscher, did Wilson's religious background have any effect on his accomplishments while he held office?

MR. HECKSCHER: I am glad that this question is brought up. I did feel, as we were talking along, that we had neglected one of the great fields of interest and one of the great sources of power of Woodrow Wilson. We have talked about his philosophy his work as an educator, work as a political scientist, but we haven't said anything about his religious training and his religious conviction. I don't think there is any question but that Woodrow Wilson's faith, Woodrow Wilson's profound conviction in an almighty power leading the world toward justice and brotherhood guided him and played an enormous part in the practical development in this country during those years. It is also said sometimes, of course, that Wilson mistook some of his own policies for those of the Almighty.

DR. WITMAN: I am going to ask Senator Barkley who has had the longest experience and contact with this question if he will tell us his judgment of Mr. Wilson's most important one or two contributions to American life today.

SEN. BARKLEY: I agree with Dr. Darden that his effort in behalf of world organization for peace was perhaps his outstanding contribution to the conditions of our present day because they laid the foundation. But I think next to that stands his contribution to a reassessment of the values of public life, the responsibilities of government to the people and the response that people will make to anything they believe to be just, fair and honorable government. He recreated the atmosphere of politics during his eight years.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you. This has been a very exciting evening and an analysis of a brilliant man and a gentleman who has contributed enormously to this country's future and this country's present. This brilliant analysis has been made possible by our three guest speakers, Senator Barkley, President Darden and Mr. Heckscher and we thank you very much indeed.

Thanks, too, to our hosts, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia; Delegate George M. Cochran, Chairman; and Dr. Bernard Bain, Executive Director.

Thanks also to Charles Blackley and his staff at Station WTOM.